

letter, but we didn't think it was our purpose to censor her. Let's get rid of censorship and allow the American people to hear the facts as they are argued on both sides.

□ 2030

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REVISIONS TO THE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS AND BUDGETARY AGGREGATES ESTABLISHED BY THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010)

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, under sections 442(a) and (b) of S. Con. Res. 13, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, I hereby submit a revised 302(a) allocation for the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2010. Section 422(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 directs the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust discretionary spending limits for certain program integrity initiatives if such an initiative is included in an appropriations bill. The bill H.R. 3293 (Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes) includes appropriations for certain such initiatives in accordance with S. Con. Res. 13. Section 422(b) of S. Con. Res. 13 permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust discretionary spending limits for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program under specified conditions. H.R. 3293 meets the requirements of section 422(b) of S. Con. Res. 13. A table is attached.

This adjustment is filed for the purposes of section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. For the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, this adjusted allocation is to be considered as an allocation included in the budget resolution, pursuant to section 427(b) of S. Con. Res. 13.

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS—APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION		
(In millions of dollars)		
	BA	OT
Current allocation:		
Fiscal Year 2009	1,482,201	1,247,872
Fiscal Year 2010	1,088,659	1,307,323
Changes for H.R. 3293 (Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act):		
Program integrity initiatives:		
Fiscal Year 2009	0	0

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS—APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION—Continued		
(In millions of dollars)		
	BA	OT
Fiscal Year 2010	846	734
LIHEAP:		
Fiscal Year 2009		
Fiscal Year 2010	1,900	1,463
Revised allocation:		
Fiscal Year 2009	1,482,201	1,247,872
Fiscal Year 2010	1,091,405	1,309,520

OUR FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM AND THE ROLE OF BIG GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, what we will see over the next 60 minutes is a conversation here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives about our economy, this issue of energy, and innovation; frankly, our free enterprise system in the future, the role of the government, and I think the problems with excessive spending.

But I want to open by talking a little bit about how I have vested my time and energies as a Member of the House over these last 15 years—because it's a privilege to serve my last term here in the House as I am a candidate for governor of the State of Tennessee now—but I will tell you, I am one on the Republican side that has been extraordinarily active on alternative energy. For 8 years, I chaired the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus here in the House with Congressman—now Senator—MARK UDALL of Colorado.

We built a caucus of over half the House, almost evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans, and advocated while Republicans were in the majority for unprecedented investments in renewable energy technologies. None of us got as far as we would like to have gotten, but we need to be realistic about how far we have gotten and what the capacity is for renewable sources today.

But in 2005, we wrote the Energy Policy Act. Some people didn't like it, others did, but without question it had more investments in the renewable and energy efficiency sectors than any bill that had ever been signed into law before, and I was proud to help write that very language in that bill. So I've got a long history on alternative energy and moving towards new sources.

But I voted against the recent cap-and-trade legislation because the differences today are not differences in goals or motives, because I think all Members of the House want the United States to move away, as much as possible, from fossil fuels or dirtier ways to create energy for our country's competitiveness. But the fact is, we have not developed these alternative sources yet to move as rapidly away as the

leadership of the Congress now proposes if we're going to remain competitive. Their approach is much more a regulatory approach, and our approach is much more an innovation and technology approach.

A year and a half ago, I was in China, in Shanghai, where you couldn't see from one side of the Bund, the river, to the other. Extraordinarily bad pollution. So we broached the subject with the Chinese: Where are you on the environment? Basically, the answer you get from the Chinese is, you are entitled to your industrial revolution; we're entitled to ours.

Well, there's a big difference between when the United States had their industrial revolution and China having theirs now if there's no environmental regulation, because they're literally one-fifth of the world's population and climbing, and they are far and away the biggest polluters in the world. And if you think they're doing a cap-and-trade scheme to regulate their pollution or their air quality or their carbon emissions, you're kidding yourself. They're exactly the opposite.

And here we are seriously considering a scheme that will dramatically regulate our productivity and our competitiveness, raise the cost of energy, frankly raise taxes to pay for it and, at the worst time since the Great Depression, strangle our ability actually to pull out of this economic downturn. And that is the beauty of American innovation.

Not long ago, I was personally speaking with the prime minister of Australia, and he was telling me that he had great hope for the future because the U.S. had such innovation that we would lead the world out of this economic malaise. But I've got to tell you, we are now moving more towards big government regulation and the lack of innovation than at any time in modern history, instead of moving towards it.

Now, I think this is a challenge that we share in the House, but we have got to get back to a reasonable middle ground because American innovation is the only way to turn this economy around. Our entrepreneurship is the beautiful, what I call the goose, that lays the golden egg, the engine that creates the revenues to get back to a balanced budget. That's how the budget got balanced in the 1990s. We did slow the growth of spending below inflation and that was laudable, but it was new revenues in the information sector. People like Bill Gates. We actually led the world for so long on the information revolution that revenues surpassed expenses, and we balanced the budget.

We could do that again with energy. I call it the En-Tech agenda, where we would have a robust, U.S.-led manufacturing explosion in new energy solutions instead of this regulatory scheme that says we're going to actually limit the amount of energy that can be produced by certain sources and mandate a certain amount by other sources. And